## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	)	Case No. CR	17-512 (VC)
Plaintiff, v.	)	CTIDIII ATED C	ORDER EXCLUDING TIME PEEDY TRIAL ACT
CLEWELAND MARTIN	)		OCT 13 2017
Defendant.	)	527	NORTHERN DISTRICT COS
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on October 19, 2017, the Court excludes time things, the Speedy Trial Act from October 3, 2017 to Namber 2017 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):			
Failure to grant a continuance woul See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ld be likel	y to result in a mi	iscarriage of justice.
The case is so unusual or so complex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of defendants, the nature of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact or law, that it is unreasonable to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial itself within the time limits established by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).			
Failure to grant a continuance woul taking into account the exercise of o	•		
Failure to grant a continuance would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given counsel's other scheduled case commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. <i>See</i> 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
Failure to grant a continuance woul necessary for effective preparation, See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).			
IT IS SO ORDERED.  DATED: 10-13-17  STIPULATED:			SCOTT CORLEY Magistrate Judge
Attorney for Defendant		Assistant United	States Attorney